

### Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed July 8, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 were examined and stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13-15, 18-21, and 24 are amended. No claims are cancelled. No new claims are added. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-25 are respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 11-14, and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,577,907 to Czysteczewski, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Czysteczewski"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments and for the reasons stated below.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "identifying different types of network destinations for receiving a document based on preferred mode of receipt by the recipient" (emphasis added). Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 10, line 28 to page 11, line 6. The cited references fail to teach or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action cites to Czysteczewski at col. 6, lines 62-67, which states:

*"Another advantage is that the centralized services may be upgraded in a modular fashion as they reach the end of their useful life, or as new features become available. The databases 150 serve*

*as a single focal point of organization information, which simplifies changes and updates."*

This citation discloses the multifunction device being able to access centralized services/features as they become available. But there is no teaching of identifying different types of network destinations based on preferred mode of receipt by the recipient.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited reference and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2-7 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-7 is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 5 is amended to recite "wherein identifying said different types of network destinations is based at least in part on a user-sorted type of network destination." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 11, lines 7-13. Czyszczewski fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action relies on Czyszczewski at col. 11, lines 18-27, which states:

*". . . The user can then employ the touch screen interface 40 to locate another user by their partially entered name. The interface 10 then displays the recipients e-mail and fax information so that the*

*user can select between faxing or e-mailing the document to the recipient."*

This citation teaches against the amended claims because the user is required to select between faxing or e-mailing the document to the recipient. Claim 5 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 6 is amended to recite "wherein formatting said document is automatically determined based at least in part on a property of the different types of network destinations." Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 13, line 33 to page 14, line 6. Czyszczewski fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action relies on Czyszczewski at col. 8, lines 5-7 and col. 8, lines 12-15, which state:

*"... if a different printer 43 or 53 is chosen, then the Postscript<sup>TM</sup> driver is adapted for the desired printer . . . . [1]n some cases the data is transformed into a .pdf format which is sent as e-mail."*

Although these citations disclose converting the document to different formats, there is no teaching or suggestion of automatically determining the format based at least in part on a property of the network destination. To the contrary, Czyszczewski goes on to explain that the formatting steps B or C depend on input from the user. Col. 8, lines 42-43. Claim 6 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 11 is amended to recite "identifying preferred network destinations for each of a plurality of recipients to receive said electronic

document" (emphasis added). As discussed in detail above for claim 1, Czyszczewski does not teach or suggest at least these recitations of claim 11.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 11 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 12-14 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-14 is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 13 as amended is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 5. Claim 14 as amended is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 6.

Claim 18 is amended to recite "program code for automatically determining format for said document" (emphasis added). As discussed in detail above for claim 6, Czyszczewski does not teach or suggest at least these recitations of claim 18.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 18 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Claims 19-23 depend from claim 18, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 19-23 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18 and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-23 is respectfully requested.

In addition, claims 19 and 21 as amended are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Claim 20 as amended is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 5.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Office Action rejected claims 8-10, 15-17, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Czyszczewski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813 to Yacoub (hereinafter referred to as "Yacoub"). The section 103 rejection is believed to be moot in view of the amendments and for the reasons stated below.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 1, claims 15-17 depend from claim 11, and claims 24-25 depend from claim 18. Claims 1, 11, and 18 are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above and therefore claims 8-10, 15-17, and 24-25 are also believed to be allowable.

In addition, Claim 8 is amended to recite "resending said document to a next preferred network destination for the same recipient upon a predetermined condition being satisfied" (emphasis added). Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 12, lines 8-22. The combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action relies on Yacoub at col. 2, lines 15-20, which states:

*"... If an error signal is returned by the selected printer, the virtual printer automatically selects a different printer closely complying with said preferences."*

Although Yacoub discloses selecting a different printer, there is no teaching or suggestion of resending a document to a next preferred network destination for the same recipient. Claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons.

In addition, claims 15 and 24 as amended are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 8.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9-27-2005

By: Mark D. Trenner

Mark D. Trenner  
Reg. No. 43,961  
(720) 221-3708